

## Autobiography and Art in Horace

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON

One of the chief developments of Roman literature involved the creation of genres in which the writer spoke forth in the first person, most notably, poetic satire and love elegy. At the same time that some writers were creating these personal or subjective genres, others were also modifying the once-impersonal genres and producing epic with the subjective qualities of Vergil's *Aeneid* or of—in an even more marked fashion—Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. It is obvious that Romans of the first century B.C. found it very natural to talk of themselves and to hear others speak of themselves and that egoism was not a distressing factor. On the contrary, personal writings seemed to have the appeal of ingenuous confessions that reveal the common humanity of us all. Subjective poetry was not, however, exactly the same as subjective conversation, not even when the satirists claimed to be conversing informally and spontaneously or when the love elegists affected to be addressing themselves directly to the circumstances of their love. Between the poet and his honest effusions were meter, the conventions of his genre, and his own ar-

tistic goals, to mention but the most patent obstacles to direct communication. Moreover, the poet had to consider his audience: what did it expect, to what extent could he manipulate those expectations fruitfully? Here then, we have the two elements that form my subject: autobiography on the one hand, art on the other. I should like to explore the complicated interrelationships of these two in the work of the Roman poet who, beyond all others, has utilized a subjective manner and the subjective genres, who indeed has told us more about himself than any other Roman poet while achieving an art in those genres that no other Roman poet ever equalled. I refer, of course, to Horace.

We possess a reasonably good though brief biography of Horace that was compiled, on the basis of sound evidence, within about a century of his death.<sup>1</sup> It tells us a few things that Horace himself does not tell us, but the important thing is that it agrees very well with the scattered data provided by the poet in his various poems. What it ignores, we have learned to regard as particularly important, thanks to the discoveries of Freud and modern psychiatry: we would like to know a great deal more about Horace's childhood and formative years. For that kind of information, we are obliged to go to Horace's poetry. Here is part of a famous early passage in *Satire* 1.4 where he describes his father:

. . . insuevit pater optimus hoc me, 105  
 ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando.  
 cum me hortaretur, parce, frugaliter, atque  
 viverem uti contentus eo quod mi ipse parasset,  
 "nonne vides Albi ut male vivat filius, utque  
 Baius inops? magnum documentum ne patriam rem 110  
 perdere quis velit": a turpi meretricis amore  
 cum deterreret, "Scetani dissimilis sis":  
 ne sequerer moechas concessa cum venere uti  
 possem, "deprenti non bella est fama Treboni"  
 aiebat: "sapiens, vitatu quidque petitu 115  
 sit melius, causas reddet tibi: mi satis est si

<sup>1</sup> The biography of Horace was put together by Suetonius and included in his collection *De poetis* (ed. A. Rostagni, Turin: Biblioteca di Filologia Classica, 1964), a product of the first decade of the second century A.D. The most elegant analysis of this biography and the most readable discussion of additional details provided by Horace will be found in Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 1-23.

traditum ab antiquis morem servare tuamque,  
 dum custodis eges, vitam famamque tueri  
 incolumem possum; simul ac duraverit aetas  
 membra animumque tuum, nabis sine cortice." sic me 120  
 formabat puerum dictis; (S. 1.4.105-121)

[My wonderful father used to pick out examples of faults and call them to my attention, so that I would avoid them. When he urged me to be thrifty, frugal, and content with what he provided me, he would say: "Don't you see how bad a life the son of Albius has, how Baius is bankrupt? That's strong evidence to prove that you shouldn't waste your father's money." When he would deter me from a debasing love affair with a prostitute, he would say: "Don't be like Scetanius." To prevent me from pursuing willing adulteresses, he would remark: "When Trebonius was caught in bed with someone's wife his reputation was damaged." And he added: "Someday the philosopher will explain to you better what you should avoid and what seek; I am satisfied if I can maintain the customs handed down by the past and keep your life and reputation undamaged so long as you need a guardian. As soon as years have hardened your body and your character, you will be on your own." It was with words like these that my father shaped me when I was young.]

In this era of permissive education, we may not quite comprehend a personality like that of Horace's father, but we have little difficulty in identifying it. He was an authoritarian parent. The important point to note here, though, is that Horace is paying tribute to the authoritarian aspect of his father and claiming that, in his own moral poetry, he has inherited the same propensity.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> I use the term "authoritarian" loosely and as the antithesis of the term "permissive." Greco-Roman New Comedy had for several centuries suggested a dichotomy of father types: the father who was severe, domineering, rather frightening, and too often angry vs. the father who was indulgent and easygoing. Not all domineering fathers need be represented as angry, but New Comedy portrayed them this way in order to exploit their greatest dramatic and comic potentialities. Plautus's *Bacchides*, adapted from Menander, shows the standard pairing of *senex iratus* and *lepidus*, Nicobulus and Philoxenus; and Terence's plays, especially the Menandrian *Adelphoe* (about which I shall have more to say), frequently manipulate these two kinds of fathers. E. W. Leach ("Horace's *pater optimus* and Terence's Demea: Autobiographical Fiction and Comedy in *Sermo* 1.4," *AJP* 92 [1971]: 616-632 makes the interesting suggestion that Horace deliberately constructs the details of this passage as "autobiographical

Before we consider this passage more fully, let me cite a passage of somewhat similar content:

When you kick out for yourself, Stephen—as I daresay you will one of these days—remember, whatever you do, to mix with gentlemen. When I was a young fellow I tell you I enjoyed myself. I mixed with fine decent fellows. Everyone of us could do something. One fellow had a good voice, another fellow was a good actor, another could sing a good comic song, another was a good oarsman or a good racket player, another could tell a good story and so on. We kept the ball rolling anyhow and enjoyed ourselves and saw a bit of life and we were none the worse for it either. But we were all gentlemen, Stephen—at least I hope we were—and bloody good honest Irishmen too. That's the kind of fellows I want you to associate with, fellows of the right kidney. I'm talking to you as a friend, Stephen. I don't believe a son should be afraid of his father.

As you probably have realized, this comes from Joyce's autobiographical novel, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*,<sup>3</sup> and the son reacts with disgust to his father's advice. The words Joyce puts into the mouth of the father of Stephen Dedalus are meant to mock the older man and help to indicate the new directions ahead of the sensitive young artist, who scorns gentlemen of his father's type, rejects the easy use of the adjective *good*, and detects in his father almost everything that is wrong with Ireland and the Irish. Joyce inherited a great deal from his father, but he consciously struggled against it all through his adolescent and adult years.

Of course, by any standards, James Joyce was an extraordinary person, and his reaction against his father went beyond that of most people. Nevertheless, as our own experience should tell us and as modern psychiatry has led us to believe, sons naturally react against fathers during childhood and adolescence, at certain periods more than others. And what especially provokes filial reaction is a preachy father. Was the relation between Horace and his father unusually amicable, or does Horace merely reconstruct it in that manner for artistic purposes? When we come down to it, Horace was quite as extraordinary a person in his achievements as James Joyce later was,

fiction" in a recognizable comic pattern in order to define his relationship to Lucilius. Although my interpretation uses the data differently, Leach's argument is very tempting.

<sup>3</sup> I have cited the text from *The Portable James Joyce* (New York: Viking Press, 1948), p. 341.

and we can hardly deny him the sensitivity of growing poetic awareness that Joyce had as a young man.

Someone might be tempted to object to the suggestion of a link between Joyce and Horace on grounds that first-century Rome differed radically from twentieth-century Dublin, and Roman sons respected their fathers unquestioningly, while Irish sons were more rebellious. Let me put Horace's autobiographical comments in a clearer perspective by citing a passage from one of Terence's comedies, which was written more than a century before the satire. In this passage a father, convinced of the efficacy of his methods of bringing up his son, describes them with passionate enthusiasm to a slave who, with barely concealed mockery, congratulates the old man.

*DE.* Syre, praeceptorum plenust istorum ille. *SY.* phy!  
domi habuit unde disceret. *DE.* fit sedulo:  
nil praetermitto; consuefacio; denique  
inspicere, tamquam in speculum, in vitas omnium 415  
iubeo atque ex aliis sumere exemplum sibi:  
"hoc facito." *SY.* recte sane. *DE.* "hoc fugito." *SY.* callide.  
*DE.* "hoc laudist." *SY.* istaec res est. *DE.* "hoc vitio datur."  
*SY.* probissime. *DE.* porro autem. *SY.* non hercle otiumst  
nunc mi auscultandi. piscis ex sententia 420  
nactus sum: î mihi ne corrumpantur cautiost. (*Adelphoe* 412-421)

[*Demea.* Yes, Syrus, my boy is full of good principles of that kind.

*Syrus.* Of course. He has someone like you at home to learn from.

*Demea.* And learn he does, all the time. I never miss a chance to teach him. I get him used to it. I tell him to look at everybody's lives as if they were mirrors, to take other people as examples. Like "do this . . ."

*Syrus.* That's really great.

*Demea.* "Don't do that . . ."

*Syrus.* Excellent.

*Demea.* "People approve of that."

*Syrus.* Right on.

*Demea.* "This, now, they disapprove . . ."

*Syrus.* Splendid.

*Demea.* And then I go on . . .

*Syrus.* I'm sorry, but I haven't time to hear any more now. I've bought some excellent fish, and I want to make sure *they* aren't ruined.]

The dramatic context of Terence's comedy leaves no doubt as to how we are to interpret the father's words. For all his genuine attempts to drill right principles into his son, this father has failed ridiculously. And the pathetic thing is that he does not know his failure and believes the slave when he uses flattery to deceive him. His son has in fact rejected the examples held up to him and has fallen in love with the first prostitute who pretended some interest in him. In Greco-Roman comedy, sons regularly go against their fathers' wishes. The stricter and more authoritarian a father is, in fact, the more likely it is that the son will rebel against him and that the playwright will manipulate our sympathies in favor of the son. But even when the father is lenient, the son will disappoint him, because the young men featured in these comedies are at the age when they will test their own strength and naturally try things that fathers have told them not to do.

There is, then, nothing unusual in the way Horace represents his father's using examples to deter him from harmful behavior and appealing to tradition: fathers do that. What is unusual is the totally acquiescent role that Horace assigns himself. I find it quite incredible. When he heard his father preaching to him, he surely must have felt the same restlessness and occasional resentment that any son has ever felt on such occasions, from the time of Terence to that of Joyce and right up to the present (as so many contemporary movies like *The Graduate* demonstrate). Two observations, I think, will confirm my argument. First, Horace did not fully imitate his father when he grew up. Although he maintained a moralistic strain throughout his poetry, he rejected the preachy, authoritarian manner. In place of the seemingly dead earnestness of the father, we find in Horace the smiling tolerance of one who knows that we all make mistakes, that an occasional love affair with a prostitute is normal, that sometimes overeating and drunkenness are appropriate. The fact that father and son choose to convey their ethical ideas differently suggests that a certain critical tension exists between them. Second, Horace seems to be using his father in *Satire* 1.4 to make a polemic point, not merely to provide autobiographical data. In order to convince his audience that his moral satire is designed not to wound but to instruct, Horace tells them that he has learned his methods from his father, who clearly used moral examples to educate his son. Thus, he cancels presuppositions that as a satirist he might resemble the caustic

Lucilius or any standard scandalmonger: he is like a concerned father. A charming image. But does it sound convincing, when we realize that Horace was a young man of thirty at most, an ambitious young poet eager for patronage? In my opinion, the "fatherly" Horace of *Satire* 1.4 reveals the interworking of art and autobiography.

It is generally assumed, on the basis of our meager evidence, that Horace's father exercised the major influence on his childhood and adolescence.<sup>4</sup> Of Horace's mother, we know nothing; he never mentions her, and he shows little interest in mothers in general.<sup>5</sup> Psychiatrists might make much of this unmentioned mother, perhaps by drawing interesting connections with Horace's failure to marry and have children and by trying to isolate some warped sexuality. I

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Fraenkel, *Horace*, p. 5: "The poet knows that he owes more to his father than to anyone else." Fraenkel carefully discusses the occupation of the elder Horace. Horace never tells us the origin of his *pater libertinus*, and most scholars assume, as I do, that his father was one of the numerous slaves imported from the Greek world. Recently, however, N. Terzaghi ("Il padre di Orazio," *Atene e Roma* 10 [1965]: 66-71) proposes the ingenious theory that Horace's father was an unusual case, the product of a union between a freeborn citizen, Horatius, and a slave woman. Under these circumstances, the child would legally be a slave. Terzaghi hypothesizes that the father immediately emancipated his son, so that for all practical purposes Horace's father lived as a free man, though under the stigma of ignoble birth. The evidence is by no means conclusive.

<sup>5</sup> W. H. Alexander ("The Enigma of Horace's Mother," *CP* 37 [1942]: 385-397) attempted to work out a theory about the unmentioned mother. Working primarily from *Serm.* 1.6, Alexander suggests that Horace's father was probably a Levantine Greek, that his mother (possibly alluded to in line 36 as *ignota matre*) might have been a Levantine Jew, and that Horace was ashamed to mention her in the face of the marked hostility to Jews in Rome. Again, the evidence is tenuous. By examining the contexts in which Horace uses the word *mater* and its adjective, one may arrive at the following conclusions: Horace uses *mater* mostly in conventional situations such as would be well defined by poetic and social traditions. Twice, he mentions the dominating mother type, in *C.* 3.6.39-40 (a patent allusion to the distant historical past of Italy) and *Epist.* 1.1.22 (reference to a free mother in an average free family); neither of these situations applies to himself, and Horace attaches no special emotion whatsoever to the mother. E. E. Best, Jr., in *CJ* 65 (1969-1970): 199-204, discusses the influence of certain mothers of prominent Roman families upon the careers of their sons. Educated mothers (*mater docta*) often inspired their sons to become great orators and politicians. However, Horace's situation is by no means similar. Nor is it like that of the poet Persius, whose twice-widowed mother presumably carefully planned the training that influenced his short career: she was a woman of good birth and considerable education and influence.

might remind those who wish to essay this Freudian theme that the biography provides us with one extraordinary fact, one that has perplexed and disturbed classicists for centuries. In his mature years, we are told, Horace placed mirrors all about his bedroom so that he could enjoy various perspectives of himself and his mistress when in sexual intercourse!<sup>6</sup> But rather than work in a vacuum, I would prefer to concentrate on the father, about whom we know a few things. He was a slave of unknown origin, who had been freed by his master and later settled in Venusia, earning a modest income as collector of money for an auctioneer. Although this background hardly entitled him to large ambitions, Horace's father decided to take his son from Venusia and give him the best possible education in Rome.<sup>7</sup> Every day, he attended young Horace to school and served him more as a slave than as a father. What did he intend for his son? According to Horace, his father had no grandiose plans and would not have been ashamed if the son had followed him in the lowly role of collector for auctions.<sup>8</sup> I am not so sure of that.

When we try to produce a coherent sketch of Horace's father, using the evidence Horace gives us, our interpretation differs from the one Horace emphasizes. The man who insists on driving home-spun morality into the heart of his son appeals to the ancestral customs of a culture to which he came as a slave. As soon as he has a little money, he transports himself and his son to the capital city and sacrifices all in order that his son may have the same educational opportunities as the sons of the most distinguished Roman families. Why? Because the Horatian pattern resembles the pattern of many immigrant families in nineteenth-century America, we tend to assume that Horace's father wanted his son to make good in terms of the Roman dream. All that education would enable Horace to become a rhetorician and politician, not a collector or ordinary businessman.<sup>9</sup> It may be true that the father's authoritarianism confined itself to moralistic admonitions, but I think it more likely that he also

<sup>6</sup> So Suetonius: "ad res Venerias intemperantior traditur; nam speculato cubiculo scorta dicitur habuisse disposita, ut quocumque respexisset ibi ei imago coitus referretur" (p. 119 Rostagni).

<sup>7</sup> These details are provided by Horace himself in *Serm.* 1.6.71–82.

<sup>8</sup> nec timuit sibi ne vitio quis verteret olim  
si praeco parvas aut, ut fuit ipse, coactor  
mercedes sequer; neque ego essem questus. (*S.* 1.6.85–87)

<sup>9</sup> Such a career was apparently planned for Vergil by his farmer-father, for

urged his son toward specific goals. Horace admired his father, respected him for all his sacrifices, and perhaps went along with the ambitions that were held out to him. But by 35 B.C., the date of our *Satire*, the immigrant dream had been exploded. Horace had failed to make a successful political start because he chose the losing side at the battle of Philippi, and about the same time his father lost his money and died. Without money and political support, Horace had no chance of success in ordinary ambitions.

Another early satire (1.6) tries to make Horace the model of unambitious integrity.<sup>10</sup> To accomplish this, the satirist most ingeniously exploits both his friendship with Maecenas, the second most powerful man in Rome, and his now-dead ex-slave father. His friendship with Maecenas has no political overtones, he claims, because he did not push himself on the great man, and Maecenas can distinguish between true friendship and political opportunism.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, Maecenas has freed himself of prejudices and does not let Horace's ignoble birth interfere with an honest recognition of his merits; and, from Horace's viewpoint, it is his ex-slave father who has given him the character that wins Maecenas's affection. Now Joyce might have said that his father made him an anti-Irish writer, and it would have been true in a certain sense. We know, however, that Joyce's father had no such designs for his eldest son. Similarly, we may doubt that Horace's father intended to make his son what he became. But Horace could later affirm that his poetic success and the creative friendship with Maecenas resulted<sup>12</sup> from the tension between his own sensitivity, his failures, and his father's driving purposes.

Once again, autobiography and art interact in this *Satire*. Horace affectionately credits his father for making him the happy man he is

Catullus and Ovid by their middle-class parents. In each case, however, the son exploited his Roman training in rhetoric to enhance his poetic talent.

<sup>10</sup> For an able analysis of the main themes of this poem, see Niall Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1966), pp. 36–53.

<sup>11</sup> Horace gives his account of how the friendship developed in 49–64.

<sup>12</sup> I am offering a theory to account for what Horace says of himself, and it may be wrong. Not everyone in Augustan Rome would have accepted it. One can infer from what Horace says about the backbiting he suffered (*S.* 1.6.46–52) that some contemporaries regarded the poet as a typical climber. As they saw it, he had used his money while it lasted to buy himself a military command at Philippi; then, when the money was gone, Horace had tried to worm his way into friendship with powerful Maecenas in order to exploit the opening that the

at the time of writing; and he boasts of this ex-slave instead of apologizing for him. But had Horace's father been alive, one might have heard different ideas from him: he might have understood his son no better than those who attacked Horace's supposed ambitions.

I believe that we can infer the powerful influence of Horace's father on his childhood, but I doubt that this time in the poet's life was precisely as free of tension as Horace later implies. He credits his father with the hard-won results of his own personal development without ever expressly revealing the older man's purposes. In the authoritarian portrait he produces of the ex-slave, I find it difficult to detect a man who would readily acquiesce in his son's choice to be a struggling poet. It is probably also significant that Horace mentions his father only in these two early satires that I have so far discussed and in one late passage, which I shall discuss. If the father dominated the poet's youth as much as Horace claims, if Horace feels the affection for this father that he states he does, we might expect more references to the old man, at least in the form of straight autobiographical comments. The fact is, though, that none of the subjective confessions in Horace's poetry is straight autobiography. In his first published poems, Book I of the Satires, Horace purposely defined himself in terms of his father, to suggest paradoxically that he was identical with his excellent father in using home-spun morality and pursuing the simplest of goals in life. Later, when he was successful and had a villa in the Sabine Hills and powerful friends in Rome, when he was reckoned among the foremost artists of Roman poetry, the chasm between simple father and sophisticated son was too obvious to bridge by ingenious art. And Horace's father disappears from the poetry. I do not mean that he disap-

---

friendship would give him to power and money. Such critics would have been disposed to dismiss Horace's words of filial affection as utter lies. For my part, I believe that Horace did honor his father and give him credit for the happy, if unanticipated, results that came from his father's concerned upbringing. But I daresay that Horace knew his poetic career would have surprised the old man. Those critics more expert in psychoanalysis may find that these data suggest another interpretation. My friend John Trimble has mentioned that he detects in Horace's behavior signs of what is called a "reaction-formation"; that is, Horace may neurotically have been covering up his difficulties with his father by honoring him greatly after his death. See Otto Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1945), pp. 151-153.

peared from Horace's affections and gratitude, only that art no longer needed that kind of autobiography.

I have suggested that the battle of Philippi proved to be a turning point in Horace's life, because it caused him to discard most of the goals that his father had encouraged him to aim at.<sup>13</sup> Horace does not tell us about the difficulties he encountered in the years between the military disaster and his successful meeting with Maecenas, who became his friend and patron (a new kind of father). We know that he held a civil service post in Rome, but it is not difficult to guess that he merely performed his job while his mind was elsewhere. Slowly he adjusted to the disaster, began to write poetry that won him friends among the poets, and gradually from the failure of his political ambitions emerged a new and more viable career as poet. From the vantage point of success twenty years later, Horace no longer interpreted Philippi as a personal disaster, but as a divine blessing, the miraculous intervention of some benevolent force that freed him for the happiness and sense of power that he now felt. Once he may have regretted escaping with his life from the battlefield. By the time he wrote *Ode* 2.7 (at least a decade after the early satires), he could represent his survival as miraculous preservation. Art collaborates with autobiography to produce a charming "myth." As he now tells it, in the moment of rout, he had abandoned his shield ignobly and was fleeing, when suddenly the god Mercury lifted him up and transported him in thick mist away from danger to safety.<sup>14</sup> Why did Mercury intervene? Horace is not so gauche as to boast of his successful career, but he implies that Mercury, as

<sup>13</sup> It is interesting to observe that the Suetonian biography treats Horace as though his life first became significant at Philippi: it offers no details about his youth. In a recent article, K. Büchner ("Horace et Epicure," *Assoc. Guillaume Budé, Actes du viii<sup>e</sup> Congrès* [1969], pp. 457-469) focuses on the trauma of Philippi in a different fashion. He argues that one can detect in Book I of the Satires a strenuous effort by Horace to cope with his loss of faith in Roman values by giving serious thought to the values offered by Epicureanism. The defeat at Philippi was both a shock to his political ideals and a permanent blow to possible political ambitions.

<sup>14</sup> Critics generally agree that Horace's self-conscious reference to the abandonment of his shield, while it no doubt could fit his actual behavior at Philippi, was meant in this poem to align him with the celebrated Greek poets Archilochus and Alcaeus, who boasted of their unheroic flight in time of war. Thus, the allusion to the Greek poets and the mythical account of escape form part of a coherent whole.

messenger of the gods and inventor of the lyric instrument, has saved Horace from political ambitions so that he could develop his special divinely blessed talents as poet.

Horace likes to use this motif of miraculous preservation to define, usually with enough irony to take away the tone of boasting, his special vocation as poet. Such a motif is a feature of the Odes, but appears originally in S. 9 of the first book of Satires.<sup>15</sup> Once when Horace was struggling helplessly to escape a leachlike fellow whose ambitions were worse than his mere garrulity, Apollo, he claims, intervened and rescued him from certain extinction. Why? Because he was an innocent poet, both helpless and unfit for the ambitious world in which he was placed by the bore. Apollo's rescue, like Mercury's intervention in *Ode* 2.7, borrows from Homeric battle motifs and thus gives the scene exaggerated epic tones that enable us to smile with the poet at his escape. Perhaps the most obviously amusing of these Horatian myths is the famous *Ode* 1.22. Horace reports that he was singing a love poem he wrote in honor of his girl Lalage when along came a gigantic wolf. However, even though the wolf was huge and Horace unarmed, the wolf turned tail and fled. Why? Obviously not because Horace's voice was so terrible that it frightened the beast, but because a love poet bears a charmed life and passes unscathed through all dangers! Maybe Horace once did see a wolf for a second on his Sabine farm, but, if so, art has taken over autobiography from that point.

Another miraculous escape occurred when Horace was strolling on his property and a dead tree fell unexpectedly, barely missing the poet's unoffending head. Out of this personal experience the artist has created several interesting themes in different poems. The first time he refers to his escape, in *Ode* 2.13, Horace affects to have just gone through the soul-shaking episode. Naturally, then, he begins by cursing the tree. When he has spent his emotions on that motif, he reflects more reasonably on the problem of death, reaching the familiar conclusion that death is unavoidable and unforeseeable. As he ponders this theme, he speculates on what it would have been like to be dead, and in his imaginary picture of the dead Horace he implicitly explains why he was not killed. If he had died, he confidently declares, he would have gone to the special part of the

<sup>15</sup> See my article, "Horace the Unwilling Warrior: *Satire* I, 9," *AJP* 77 (1956): 148-166.

underworld set aside for the greatest poets, who by their songs are able to triumph over the miseries associated with death. Their eternal triumph over death is but a permanent version of Horace's temporary escape: he has been preserved to be a poet in his own world and, when finally he has completed his poetic mission on earth, to pass on to the immortality of his Greek models, Sappho and Alcaeus.

This special destiny of the poet, which explains on one level the miracle of Horace's life, impels the poet to use his miraculous escapes artistically to contrast with the more ordinary careers of others, whose destiny is bleak death that nevertheless cannot make them do something with the precious moments of the present. As Horace keeps observing in the Odes, we are not only not going to escape the finality of dying, but we are also so foolish in our preoccupations as to be enduring a living death. So Horace's happy escape of 2.13 is immediately contrasted in 2.14 with the inevitability of Postumus's miserable death following his miserable existence.<sup>16</sup> Twice Horace builds a single poem out of the contrast between his special providence as poet—proved by his escape from the damned tree—and Maecenas's unenviable distinction as statesman. In each of these poems, Horace credits a different divinity with his preservation. Although both deities suggest concern for the poet, their other associations explain why Horace has manipulated the autobiographical facts and as a result produced quite different poems. In *Ode* 2.17, the occasion is Maecenas's melancholy and hypochondriac presentiment of death. Horace jokes with his friend, asserts on the basis of comic manipulation of astrology and the zodiac that Maecenas will never die before himself, and then cites two incidents that supposedly prove the special destinies of each man. When Maecenas was seriously ill, he staged a miraculous recovery. Why? Obviously because the supreme god Jupiter acted to save such an important man. With a smile, Horace then adduces the incident of the dead tree as a humble parallel to Maecenas's noble escape. It was Faunus (the Roman equivalent of bucolic Pan) who intervened on Horace's behalf. As son of Mercury, Faunus watches over the favorites of Mercury. By giving the credit for his escape to Faunus, Horace deliberately portrays himself as a humble rustic and thus sets up an

<sup>16</sup> I have discussed the relationship between 2.13 and 14 more fully in "Two Odes of Horace's Book Two," *Calif. Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1 (1968): 59-61.

effective contrast between himself and the urban politician Maecenas; bucolic Faunus is opposed to Maecenas's Jupiter. Behind these contrasts, which maintain the illusion of Horace's humility, lurks a different contrast: Horace is happy and attuned to the realities of life, and he with his poetic insights must comfort the great, but greatly miserable, Maecenas.

In still another ode, 3.8, the autobiographical occasion is Horace's celebration of the anniversary of his escape, when he was almost "funerated" (as he comically puts it with a word made for the poem, *funeratus*) by the blow of the tree. Here, for a very specific reason, he provides for us the date of the near tragedy and hence of the anniversary celebration: it was March first. March first in the Roman world had great public significance as the day when husbands sacrificed to Juno, goddess of marriage, and gave presents to their wives. Yet here is Horace, a notoriously unmarried type, conducting his private rites, sacrificing not to Juno but to Liber (or Bacchus)! A comic paradox to begin the poem with. We know that Bacchus could function at times as a patron of poets; Horace's Odes show that he recognized this motif.<sup>17</sup> However, as everyone knows, Bacchus mainly connotes wine and the pleasures to be gained from drinking. When he chose to credit Bacchus for his escape, Horace was planning the most effective contrast with Juno and the more sedate ceremonies proper to the commemoration of marriage. Then he goes from this initial humorous contrast to draw a more penetrating contrast between himself, the contented poet who has come to terms with life, and Maecenas, the anxious statesman who worries himself sick over the dangers that threaten Rome. Horace then advises Maecenas to drink, to seize the pleasures offered by the moment.<sup>18</sup>

In one of the great Roman Odes, Horace draws all his miraculous escapes together, explains them pointedly as the work of the Muses, and then goes on to demonstrate poetically that the quality that works in the poet and accounts for his greatness is also at work in the ideal statesman (though in somewhat different terms). He men-

<sup>17</sup> Steele Commager (*The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962], pp. 337-341) ably analyzes the way Horace in C. 2.19 presents "Bacchus, the inspirer of poetry."

<sup>18</sup> This same contrast between statesman and poet is most fully elaborated in C. 3.29. There, in addition to the pleasures of drinking, Horace offers Maecenas the pastoral bliss of his Sabine villa.

tions the rout at Philippi, the nearly fatal incident involving the tree, and another occasion, apparently a near drowning, about which we have no other information.

vester, Camenae, vester in arduos  
tollor Sabinos, seu mihi frigidum  
Praeneste seu Tibur supinum  
seu liquidae placuere Baiae.  
vestris amicum fontibus et choris  
non me Philippis versa acies retro,  
devota non exstinxit arbos,  
nec Sicula Palinurus unda. (C. 3.4.21-28)

[I belong to you, o Muses, I belong to you, whether I go up into the Sabine Hills or sloping Tivoli or whether my delight is the water of Baiae. Because I was a friend of your fountains I was not killed during the flight from Philippi nor when the damned tree fell on me nor by the seas off Sicily.]

Horace's experience with the ubiquitous benevolence of the Muses convinces him that his future will be secure, wherever he may be, in the flesh or in the spirit. His poems will survive him. The quality that Horace isolates to define his vocation as poet and the noble vocation of Augustus, the ideal statesman, is *pietas*. The poet, by dedicating himself selflessly to poetry, establishes a firm link with the divine realm through the Muses, deities themselves. Without the assistance of the Muses, he can accomplish nothing important. That same selfless devotion to divine purposes impels the ideal statesman, who chooses to end self-aggrandizing wars in order to work for the well-being of his people in peacetime. This is the poem in which Horace most clearly defines his concept of the poet, and here, though art is very prominent, we may catch the autobiographical passion that encourages Horace to set his *métier* on a level with that of Augustus. It was precisely this sense of personal integrity that enabled him to say no both to Maecenas and to Augustus when they tried to restrict his freedom as poet and use him for purposes that they considered valid.<sup>19</sup> Whether or not they were valid, Horace

<sup>19</sup> In *Epistle* 1.7 Horace advocates independence in the face of demands that might be made on him by his friend and patron Maecenas. However, we probably should not use this *Epistle* as a historical document to prove that Maecenas did in fact mistreat Horace. In *Epistle* 2.1 Horace exhibits independence in his relations with Augustus, which tends to substantiate the story told



knew that the life he needed and wanted depended on total commitment to the Muses, absolute *pietas*.

In this same magnificent ode Horace describes the only experience of his infancy that he or anyone else ever records. When I think of what Freud did with the sole infant experience reported by Leonardo da Vinci, I somewhat tremble for Horace, but I shall go ahead.<sup>20</sup> Here are Horace's words:

me fabulosae Vulture in Apulo	
nutricis extra limen Apuliae	10
ludo fatigatumque somno	
fronde nova puerum palumbes	
texere, mirum quod foret omnibus,	
quicumque celsae nidum Acherontiae	
saltusque Bantinos et arvum	15
pingue tenent humilis Forenti,	
ut tuto ab atris corpore viperis	
dormirem et ursis, ut premerer sacra	
lauroque collataque myrto,	
non sine dis animosus infans (C. 3.4.9-20)	20

[When I was a baby, I crawled away from my nurse's house near Mt. Voltur in Apulia and, tired out from play, I fell asleep. As I lay there in the woods, miraculously, doves covered me up with fresh leaves, an absolute marvel to all who live in the region, how I slept on, safe from black vipers and bears, covered by sacred laurel and heaps of myrtle. For not without divine blessing was I, a mere baby, alive.]

I am prepared to believe that little Horace crawled away from his nurse once and that, after a long search, she found him asleep in a pile of leaves. The rest of the details, however, resemble artistic elaborations designed to give the incident special significance. After all, who could verify that doves could and did cover the baby with

by Suetonius that Augustus tried to make Horace his private secretary and was refused. See Fraenkel, *Horace*, pp. 17-20.

<sup>20</sup> See Freud's essay, *Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood* (1910), trans. A. A. Brill (New York: Random House, 1947). Leonardo reportedly remembered an odd childhood experience when a bird, apparently a kite, flew down while he was sleeping and struck him repeatedly on his lips with its tail. Freud detected many veiled sexual references in the details of this childhood memory.

leaves? Why should leaves protect the baby from vipers and bears, and who can say that they, in fact, did save him? This artistic embellishment of autobiographical fact in no way illuminates the nature of Horace. Instead, it serves to confirm his myth that from birth the Muses had consecrated Horace as their servant, and that he was destined to be the great poet he became. In this first incident of miraculous preservation we see the archetype of all the others.

The first three books of Odes, almost ninety poems, were composed over a ten-year period, and published together in 23 B.C. when Horace was forty-two. Although Horace continues to use the personal manner in his lyrics, the person we encounter in the Odes is not the same as the speaker in the Satires. Nor is it enough to observe that Horace was considerably older in the Odes than in the Satires. True, when we add a decade to age thirty, we radically change our nature, as most of us over forty regretfully admit. However, when we read the Odes, the age of the poet does not seem important. In fact, if one did not know the date of the Satires, I daresay that most readers would guess that the satirist was older than the lyric poet: the moralistic contents of the Satires suggest an older and wiser author, while the lighter contents of the erotic and drinking poems suggest that they were composed by a younger man. Generic conventions also account in large measure for the manner in which autobiographical detail is employed in the Satires and Odes. Inasmuch as a satirist is supposed to be a simple down-to-earth man, Horace can readily introduce his ex-slave father in the Satires to explain both his homespun ethics and his lack of ambition. He boasts of his father and at the same time denies himself the rank of poet in *Satire* 1.4. On the other hand, when the satirist turns into a lyric poet, those simple intimate facts about the elder Horace no longer serve his purpose. If there is one thing Horace wishes to emphasize in the lyrics, it is that he is a poet with a sacred vocation. Therefore, when the lyric poet looks into his past for relevant experiences, he no longer consciously recalls his father and all the sacrifices that started Horace on the practical road toward his career. Instead he colors an incident from his infancy in such a way as to exclude his father totally and introduce as his permanent guardians, the Muses. Earlier, Horace affectionately remembered how his father had sworn to protect his life and honor as long as he was a youth; the childhood episode cited in *Ode* 3.4 replaces Horace's

father with the Muses. I think that as Horace wrote the Odes he realized that he had left his father's narrow world far behind, and that he could no longer satisfactorily account for the gulf that now separated him from his youth except in terms of the Muses. The events at Philippi may indeed have effected the change, but Horace now began to see in other events, even a half-remembered incident from his babyhood in Apulia, the mystique of a special destiny, miraculous preservation from danger, and a consecration as poet that supposedly determined his entire life.<sup>21</sup>

In keeping with this total dedication to the Muses, Horace throughout the Odes published in 23 B.C. impresses us as a man who has not only replaced ordinary political ambitions with his commitment to poetry, but also rejected riches for a modest existence and sublimated amatory passion in his cool poems about love. Being a poet compensates him richly for all the frenetic and disappointing preoccupations of most men. As he enters his forties, Horace finds that poetry will comfort him as he grows old. I see that motif in the famous and elusive poem that Horace wrote on the Fountain of Bandusia. If we knew precisely where this humble spring was located, we might be able to control the autobiographical detail better. As it is, some scholars place it in Apulia where Horace grew up, and others are equally certain that they still see the spring today spurting from the hillside above the Sabine farm that Maecenas gave the mature poet. Nevertheless, whether the fountain represents an allusion to Horace's youth or to his maturity, the poem suggests that Horace, by sacrificing a spirited young goat to the water, is symbolically consecrating his own youthful passions. As the cool waters are briefly dyed with the hot red blood of the kid and then run clear and cold again, as those same chill springs overcome weariness and piercingly hot weather, so, in a sense, when Horace honors that cool comfort, he gracefully yields his own hot passions to the soothing actions of the Muses, the source of his life's inspiration.<sup>22</sup> In short,

<sup>21</sup> Similarly, Horace briefly looks back at his early years and humble origin in C. 3.30, the final poem of his first collection of Odes. The phrase *ex humilitate princeps* (12-13) suggests a dramatic political achievement, and only the words that follow prove that Horace is recording the miracle of his poetic success. The same ideas return in C. 4.3, written about 17 B.C.; Horace emphasizes the way the Muses pick out the future poet at the time of his birth.

<sup>22</sup> For other interpretations of the symbolism of this poem, see F. Gillen, "Symbolic Dimensions in Horace's Poetry," *CB* 37 (1961): 65-67; M. R. Lef-

during the rich years when Horace was composing his masterpieces, the Odes, art not only colored autobiography, but also became autobiography; for poetry was Horace's life.

In the fifteen years that followed before his death in 8 B.C., Horace, growing older and feeling his age, explored again his own existential purposes and redefined his relation to poetry. Instead of the passionate regrets for youth that make the poems of the older Yeats so exciting, we find in Horace a graceful resignation to age, an awareness of his limited powers that impels him to abandon lyric and the once-cherished themes of the Odes. Not that he gives up poetry. Far from it. In the opening poem of his next collection, published within three years of the Odes, Horace declares that he is henceforth putting aside verse and other light matters (*Epist.* 1.1.10), but since he utters this sentiment in a good hexameter line in the course of a carefully wrought poem, we know that he is not abandoning poetry. The hexameter, the subject matter, the express statement that the older poet does not feel the same as the younger lyric writer, and finally the more serious tone of these lines indicate that Horace is choosing a new genre to match his own new interests. At first sight, these new poems resemble the Satires in form, and we wonder why Horace has reverted to the poetry of his twenties. But when we look closer, we begin to note significant differences. The new works are Letters, ostensibly private communications addressed to friends, in which he shares personal moral concerns. In these letters Horace encourages young people to be serious about life, insists on the merit of life in the country away from the entanglements of the city, yet never calls attention to himself as poet, as confident critic of others.<sup>23</sup> And at the end of the collection he offers this miniature autobiography to his audience:

me libertino natum patre et in tenui re  
maiores pennas nido extendisse loqueris,  
ut quantum generi demas virtutibus addas;

20

kowitz, "The Ilex in *o fons Bandusiae*," *CJ* 58 (1962): 63-67; and Commager, *Odes of Horace*, pp. 322-324.

<sup>23</sup> See M. J. McGann, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles* (Brussels: Collection Latomus 100, 1969). In his discussion of the conclusion of *Epist.* 1.20, McGann supports my views: "The autobiographical sketch which ends the book is appropriately concerned with Horace as a person and in particular as a moral person rather than as a poet" (p. 86).

me primis Urbis belli placuisse domique;  
 corporis exigui, praecanum, solibus aptum,  
 irasci celerem, tamen ut placabilis essem. (*Epist.* 1.20.20–25) 25

[You may say that I was born of an ex-slave father and in straitened circumstances, but flew from my parental nest on broader wings; so what you subtract from my family you should add to my own good qualities. I have pleased the foremost men of the city in war and peace. I am short, prematurely gray, addicted to sunbathing, quick-tempered, but also easily calmed down.]

In this sole reference to his father since *Satire* 1.6, at least fifteen years earlier, Horace uses his parent only to define his humble beginnings. Neither the father nor the Muses are given credit for Horace's success. The implicit suggestion is that he has done it himself. What does this self-portrait mean? It means, I think, that for the purposes of the *Epistles*, where he talks of himself as a searcher for the right way to live, Horace wishes to represent his past as a personal achievement, one that promises success to his present search. Notice that he does not even represent himself as a poet.

If the *Epistles* have introduced a new autobiographical manner, in which Horace virtually ignores his father and seems to slight the Muses and the variety of tutelary deities (Apollo, Mercury, Faunus, Bacchus) that he associated with himself earlier, we may well ask what has happened to the rich theme of personal salvation. Salvation by the Muses alone is worse than irrelevant to the theme of the *Epistles*: it contradicts the point that Horace now emphasizes, that salvation is essentially ethical and is achieved by individual effort. Horace no longer uses the genial myth about the Muses because he no longer feels the Muses so close and realizes that poetic creation results from a great deal of hard intellectual and moral effort. Writing an epistle was a grueling job for a highly conscious artist. Unconscious inspiration, that charming madness (*amabilis insania*) which occasionally possessed him in the writing of the *Odes*, no longer worked. Sternly rejecting such uncontrolled inspiration, such poetic madness, Horace demanded of himself full rationality as he poetically worked out the vital ethical themes of the *Epistles*.

Thus, if the poet is to be saved, he must first relinquish his belief in sheer inspiration: so Horace now urges. In three important places in the *Epistles*, Horace describes playfully (but with serious intent)

the desperate state of the poet who insanely trusts to mere inspiration and will not be saved from his madness. There is an old Roman saying to the effect that saving someone who does not want to be rescued is the same as killing him. Horace ironically applies this saying to the possessed poet: since such a person clutches wildly to his delusions, coming to his senses is a traumatic experience, and perhaps it would be a mercy to let him stay mad. The first time this theme of trying to save the deluded poet occurs, Horace is, so to speak, arguing with himself. In the *Epistle* containing the autobiographical portrait which I cited above, Horace argues against a tendency in himself to seek publication and quick fame. His alter ego, the character with whom he is arguing, is represented as the Book, the collection of *Epistles*, which rushes out to display itself coquetishly in public. That popularizing attitude, Horace warns, will doom the Book to rapid oblivion, but why try to save someone who will not be saved?<sup>24</sup> The very form of this internal dialogue shows that Horace has indeed opted for a new kind of salvation.

Again, in the long *Epistle* to Florus, Horace describes the permanent struggle confronting the true poet and affects to feel too old to continue the battle. Ironically claiming that he would prefer to be a writer who is insane (*scriptor delirus*) and happy than one who is sane and miserable, he tells the story of a somewhat dotty old Greek who had a number of harmless aesthetic delusions that made him happy. Well, his family took the old man to a psychiatrist, who cured him. Instead of being grateful, the old man complained that his friends had not saved him, but killed him, for they had taken away his pleasant delusions.<sup>25</sup> And that story is supposed to prove the advantages of being insane. The recurrence of this same sequence in the *Ars poetica* in a context where Horace clearly chooses to be sane confirms the irony of this anecdote. As he says, the beginning, the very source of writing poetry properly, is the capacity to use one's reason: "scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons" (*A.P.* 309). But the poet who trusts in inspiration is a madman for whom there is no help. Look at the poet-philosopher Empedocles. He wanted to be regarded as a god and threw himself into the molten crater of Mt. Etna. A hopeless case. You just have to let poets kill themselves,

<sup>24</sup> *Epistle* 1.20.16: *quis enim invitum servare laboret?*

<sup>25</sup> *Epistle* 2.2.138–139: *pol me occidistis, amici, / non servastis.*

because, if you save them against their will, it's the same as killing them.<sup>26</sup>

This new view of the poet's role treats harshly the pleasant autobiographical constructions of the Odes and the ingeniously appealing manipulations of Horace's father in the Satires. In his final autobiography, Horace made his life a steady progress toward truth and sharply curtailed the significance of poetry in it all:

Romae nutriri mihi contigit, atque doceri  
 iratus Grai quantum nocuisset Achilles.  
 adiecere bonae paulo plus artis Athenae,  
 scilicet ut vellem curvo dinoscere rectum, 45  
 atque inter silvas Academi quaerere verum,  
 dura sed emovere loco me tempora grato,  
 civilisque rudem belli tulit aestus in arma  
 Caesaris Augusti non responsura lacertis.  
 unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi, 50  
 decisis humilem pennis inopemque paterni  
 et laris et fundi, paupertas impulit audax  
 ut versus facerem: sed quod non desit habentem  
 quae poterunt unquam satis expurgare cicutae,  
 ni melius dormire putem quam scribere versus? (*Epist.* 2.2.41–54)

[I happened to be raised in Rome, where I was taught from the *Iliad* how much the wrath of Achilles injured the Greeks. In noble Athens I then acquired a little more education, enough to want to distinguish the straight from the crooked and to seek the truth among the groves of Plato's Academy. However, hard times forced me to leave this pleasant place; the tide of civil war carried me off, an utter tyro, to join ranks that were not destined to match the might of Augustus's army. As soon as Philippi's defeat released me, humiliated, my wings clipped, deprived of my father's estate, I was driven by rash poverty to produce verse. But now that I have enough to live on, I would be incurably insane if I didn't prefer sleeping peacefully to writing verse.]

I do not mean to minimize the ironic notes in this passage; the artist is still shaping his autobiography. Thus, the assertion that poverty drove him to poetry (as though it were a means of profit) and the claim that, since his poetic efforts have insured him a guaranteed

<sup>26</sup> A.P. 466–467: *sit ius liceatque perire poetis, / invitum qui servat idem facit occidenti.*

income, he is now ready to retire from this painful and sordid occupation, must be viewed as gross exaggerations. But the total scheme for his life is unified: it is self-education, marked by a series of interruptions, leading toward his present commitment to ethical introspection. Therefore, when he refers to his education in Rome, he now talks of the ethical lessons he learned from books, and Greek books at that, not the role of his father in passing on homespun lore, not the self-sacrifice of the old man that gave him the opportunity to live in Rome in the first place. Again, it was his father who somehow scraped together the money to send Horace to Athens, but Horace disregards that point to discuss the philosophic enhancements of his training. Joining Brutus's army and fighting the disastrous battle of Philippi counts now as a hiatus in his ethical progress. We are not allowed to speculate on Horace's abortive military career as the last effect of his father's influence on the son to enter politics, nor does Horace try to read into his survival at Philippi the personal myth of salvation by the Muses. Writing poetry now becomes a stopgap, another enforced hiatus in his ethical progress. Horace has come a long way from *Satire* 1.4 where he professed uncritical admiration for his simple father and thereby defined the nature of his poetic effort.

I have been attempting to show the complex and changing interrelation of autobiography and art in the works of the most subjective of all Roman poets. Although it is tempting to doubt that some of the so-called personal experiences ever occurred, I believe that we can be satisfied for the time being that almost every episode, whether factual or not, has been shaped by the artist to fit the genre, to lend itself well to the particular kind of self-analysis of each period, and to make the most effective impression on the audience. When Horace, an unknown poet between twenty-five and thirty years of age, was writing the first book of Satires, he still felt the powerful influence of his recently dead father. In order to win favor for his kind of poetry, he used his father to define his own personality and purposes, quite consciously selecting only those details of his father's activities that fitted his needs. What is consistently unmentioned and what probably most distorts our perception of the father's influence is the exact career he had in mind for Horace. I strongly doubt that the father ever envisioned that all his sacrifices would result in a poet. In later years, Horace tended to deny his father by stressing how great he had become, how high he had soared from his humble be-

ginning, whether through the intervention of the Muses (*C.* 3.30.11–16) or by his own rational efforts (*Epist.* 2.2.41–54).

In the case of Horace, the complex interrelation of autobiography and art is particularly interesting because he is not merely trying to twist facts in order to make himself important. What he is doing is showing how the career of the artist, the responsibilities of the poet affect his own experiences at different times, even oblige him to re-interpret earlier experiences. The ambitious young poet, who thought he could reprove his readers in satire and do a better artistic job than Lucilius, eventually became convinced that his talent lay in writing lyric poetry. Horace viewed his success in this genre as that of a “friend of the Muses,” a man saved from Philippi to write poetry in the tradition of distinguished Greek poets, such as Sappho and Alcaeus. So the Odes contained little myths about his personal salvation and accounted for his phenomenal creativity during that decade by presenting him more or less as a servant of the Muses. Then came a new stage, perhaps foreshadowed by such late Odes as that on the Fountain of Bandusia, in which the poet’s advancing age increased his self-consciousness and made him no longer content with lyric or the ostensibly unthinking, almost impersonal response to the Muses. His art became cerebral again, resembling in that respect the art of the Satires, but the morality focused on the poet’s personal development; he no longer pretended to know it all and criticize others from that superior perspective. He was trying to save his own soul, and his poetry described his efforts. When he was writing the Odes, art became autobiography because poetry was Horace’s life. In this final stage of development, we must reverse the equation. Through the way Horace rejects or depreciates his earlier poetic concerns, we glimpse a new awareness: his autobiography is now poetry because his life is the only fitting poetic theme. For his older readers at least, this is the ultimate and most satisfactory integration of two uneasy factors, art and autobiography. Horace is constructing his own understanding of life as he produces his epistolary poetry. And after all, isn’t this a most profound application of the Greek word *poiesis*?

## Some Trees in Virgil and Tolkien

KENNETH J. RECKFORD

I want to offer a meditation on some trees in Virgil and Tolkien.<sup>1</sup> I shall be concerned mainly with the theme of continuity through change. I want to show, not so much that Virgil influenced Tolkien—although the *Lord of the Rings* evidently has western as well as northern roots—as that a deep affinity exists between Virgil’s mind and Tolkien’s and may be observed in the way they perceive life, in their sense of the relation between heroic choice and achievement, on the one hand, and time, change, loss, sadness, uncertainty,

<sup>1</sup> This paper represents an enlarged version of part of my paper given at the Symposium; the rest seemed less suitable to the written than the spoken word. For Virgil, I have used the text of R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969). The translations are from *The Aeneid of Virgil*, translated by C. Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; New York: A Doubleday Anchor Book, 1953; reprinted by permission of A. D. Peters and Company, the Translator’s Literary Estate, and the Hogarth Press); though not always literal, they give some sense of Virgil’s poetry. Passages from Tolkien are quoted (by permission of Houghton Mifflin Company) from *The Lord of the Rings*, vols. I–III (New York: Ballantine Books, 1965).

# Perspectives of Roman Poetry

*A Classics Symposium*

*Essays by*

GEORG LUCK

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON

KENNETH J. RECKFORD

ERICH SEGAL

G. KARL GALINSKY

*Edited and Prefaced by G. Karl Galinsky*

*Published for the College of Humanities and the College  
of Fine Arts of The University of Texas at Austin by the  
University of Texas Press, Austin and London*

HUDSON VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Main entry under title:  
Perspectives of Roman poetry.

(Symposia in the arts and the humanities, no. 1)

"Based on the formal proceedings of the symposium  
'Perspectives of Roman Poetry,' which was held at the  
University of Texas at Austin on February 14-16, 1972."

Includes bibliographical references.

I. Latin poetry—Addresses, essays, lectures.

I. Luck, Georg, 1926— II. Galinsky, Gotthard Karl,  
1942— ed. III. Texas. University at Austin.

IV. Series.

PA6047.P4 871'.009 74-5314  
ISBN 0-292-76420-0

Copyright © 1974 by the University of Texas Press  
All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Composition by G&S Typesetters, Austin

Printing by The University of Texas Printing Division, Austin

Binding by Universal Bookbindery, Inc., San Antonio

## Contents

Preface . . . . .	9
The Woman's Role in Latin Love Poetry . . . . . GEORG LUCK	15
Autobiography and Art in Horace . . . . . WILLIAM S. ANDERSON	33
Some Trees in Virgil and Tolkien . . . . . KENNETH J. RECKFORD	57
The Business of Roman Comedy . . . . . ERICH SEGAL	93
Ovid's Metamorphosis of Myth . . . . . G. KARL GALINSKY	105
The Originality of Roman Poetry . . . . . PANEL DISCUSSION	129
Notes on Contributors . . . . .	153
Index . . . . .	155